

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 were pending in the application. The non-final office action, dated April 2, 2009 rejects claims 1-28.

This paper amends claims 1, 5, 8-11, 17-19, and 21-23, and cancels claims 25-28. Applicant is not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by claims 1, 5, 8-11, 17-19, 21-23, and 25-28 prior to this Amendment is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. Claims 1, 5, 8-11, 17-19, and 21-23 were amended and claims 25-28 canceled in this Amendment solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the application. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by claims 1, 5, 8-11, 17-19, 21-23, and 25-28, as presented prior to this Amendment and additional claims in one or more continuing applications.

Claims 1-24 remain pending in the application.

Claim Objection

The Office Action objects to claim 5. Applicant has amended claim 5 in accordance with the suggestion of the Office Action.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101

The Office Action rejects Claims 21-28 under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended claims 21-24 to be directed to a computer program product comprising a computer readable medium, and amends the specification to show support more expressly in the specification for a computer readable medium. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment overcomes the rejection.

In view of the cancellation of claims 25-28, applicant submits that the rejection of such claims is moot.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office Action rejects Claims 10, and 21-28 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended claim 10 to correct the lack of antecedent basis for “customized meeting-related operation” and claim 21 to correct the lack of antecedent basis for “the third party system”. Applicant thanks the Examiner for pointing out these inadvertencies and submits that these amendments overcome the rejections of claim 10 and 21-24. In view of the cancellation of claim 25-28, applicant submits that the rejection of these claims is moot.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-14 and 16-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dalal et al. (U.S. Application Publication No. 2003/0014488), in view of Parent (US Publication No. 2001/0184301). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection to the extent it is maintained against the claims as now amended.

As now set forth in the representative independent claim 1, the applicant’s invention integrates a third-party system with an online meeting system. A service provider interface (SPI) is provided. The SPI defines a plurality of procedures for communicating with a meeting services application of the online meeting system. One of the procedures of the SPI is implemented in a third-party software module of the third-party system. The third-party software module performs, when executed, a meeting-related operation customized in accordance with the third-party system. A call is received from the meeting service application. The call is to the implemented SPI procedure of the third-party software module to perform the meeting-related operation. And thereby integrate the meeting-related operation, customized in accordance

with the third-party system, into the online meeting system. Applicant's invention thus provides a mechanism for adding customized third-party functionality to an online meeting application.

Dalal teaches a software system for providing real-time conferencing services. The system includes a service provider who controls server components in the system. These server components are a service provider conference controller (SPCC) and a service provider media server (SPMS). The SPCC performs administrative tasks related to conference management, and the SPMS handles communication payloads. Each conference is associated with a SPMS, and each conference participant establishes a real-time session with the SPMS. According to paragraphs [0036], [0040], and [0043], the SPCC receives certain types of requests (create, delete, invite) from a client. Thus, the Office Action equates the SPCC to be the applicant's claimed "service provider interface (SPI)", with the various types requests being the applicant's claimed "procedures for communicating with a meeting services application".

However, as noted on page 4 of the Office Action, "Dalal does not specifically teach that the system is a third-party system". Rather, Dalal's SPCC and SPMS components are part of the conferencing system (i.e., the "online meeting application"). Thus, the various requests (create, delete, invite) are not procedures implemented in a third-party software module, but procedures implemented in the "online meeting application" itself. Hence, unlike the applicant's claimed invention, Dalal does not implement one of the SPI procedures in a third-party software module of a third-party system, as now set forth in the applicant's claimed invention. Therefore, Dalal does not teach or suggest "implementing one of the procedures of the SPI in a third-party software module of the third-party system", as now set forth in the applicant's claimed invention.

Parent teaches that a web server may use third-party software in accomplishing its tasks, and that such third-party software may include programs to accomplish tasks that are necessary or helpful to the web server. The Office Action suggests combining Parent's teaching of the use of third-party software with Dalal's conferencing system.

This proposed combination, however, merely suggests that the components of the conferencing system (i.e., the SPCC and SPMS) can use third-party software to accomplish its tasks (i.e., the tasks of the conferencing system). The third-party software thus becomes part of the conferencing system. This means, then, that Parent's third-party software would not be "of a third-party system" nor would it provide "meeting-related functionality customized in accordance with the third-party system" as now set forth in the applicant's claimed invention. Rather, Parent's third-party software would provide functionality in accordance with Dalal's conferencing system. In effect, the combination of Parent with Dalal still has no third-party system of which to speak; there is only a conferencing system using third-party software to accomplish its tasks. Nor does Parent provide any teaching regarding the use of the third-party software to integrate third-party functionality customized according to a third-party system into the conferencing system. Therefore, Parent and Dalal, whether taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest "implementing one of the procedures of the SPI in a third-party software module of the third-party system, the third-party software module providing, when executed, meeting-related functionality customized in accordance with the third-party system", as now set forth in the applicant's claimed invention. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Each of the other independent claims 11, 17 and 21 recites claim language similar to that of independent claim 1 and is patentable for at least those reasons provided in connection with claim 1. Dependent claims 3, 5, 6, 8-10, 12-14, 16-20, and 21-24 depend directly or indirectly from one of the independent claims, and are patentable for at least those reasons presented above in connection with the particular independent claim from which each depends. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection against these claims also be withdrawn.

The Office Action also rejects claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dalal and Parent in view of Krishnaswamy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,909,708), and claims 7 and 15 over Dalal and Parent in view of Nakajima (U.S. Patent No. 6,289,510). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections because each of claims 4, 7, and 15 depends from a patentable independent claim, and is patentable for at least those reasons presented above in connection with that independent claim.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that this paper provides a response for all pending claims. Any absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment, or to any taking of “official notice” or reliance on “common sense”, however, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, comment, taking of “official notice”, or reliance on “common sense”. In addition, because the arguments made above are not exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims that have not been expressed.

In view of the amendments and arguments made herein, applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance and requests early favorable action by the Examiner.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with the applicant's representative would expedite allowance of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned at (508) 303-09032.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 2, 2009
Reg. No. 41,274

Fax No.: (508) 303-0005
Tel. No.: (508) 303-0932

/Michael A. Rodriguez/
Michael A. Rodriguez
Attorney for applicant
Guerin & Rodriguez, LLP
5 Mount Royal Avenue
Marlborough, MA 01752